

**REMARKS**

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated March 11, 2005, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 11, 2005. Accordingly, no Petition or Fee for Extension of time are believed due. In the event that the Commissioner determines that an extension of time or fee are due, the undersigned hereby petitions for such extension and authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fee to Deposit Account 13-3250.

I. Status of the Claims

Please amend claims 1-7, 9-17, and 20 as indicated above. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9-13, 17 and 20 are independent claims.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as a basis for claim rejections.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite because they claim a method and depend from claim 11, which is a computer readable medium. Applicants have amended claims 14-16 to depend from 13, which is a method claim and submit that the bases for the objection are overcome.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter as claiming only software per se. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and point out that the claim is directed to computer executable software code that is transmitted as an information signal. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As background, independent claims 1 9, 13, and 17 are each directed to methods for validating or establishing credentials. Independent claim 11 is directed to a computer

readable medium having computer executable software code stored thereon, the code for validating credentials. Independent claim 12 is directed to a programmed computer for validating credentials comprising a memory for storing computer executable program code and a processor for executing the stored computer code. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, independent claim 10 is not directed to simply a computer program, it is directed to computer executable software code transmitted as an information signal, the code for validating credentials. Applicants submit that in software sale and distribution, code for accomplishing a method may be sold and distributed on a computer readable medium (e.g., claim 11) for later installation on a computer system. The code may also be installed and sold with a computer system (e.g., claim 12). Additionally, it is common for software code to be distributed directly to users by down-load to a computer, without transfer of a computer readable medium. In order to fully protect the various types of sales and distribution activities, applicants have crafted claims to specifically cover sale and download of infringing software code, by directing claim 10 to computer software code **transmitted as an information signal**. Applicants submit that computer executable software code transmitted as an information signal serves a useful purpose just as a computer readable medium serves a useful purpose, and applicants submit that to be statutory, 35 U.S.C. § 101 requires nothing more. For this reason, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al.

Claim 1 states: determining, at a first system that grants session credentials, that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system; retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a

possible session credential for a second system that grants session credentials; presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; and determining whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system.

Applicants submit that Gupta is directed to use of a centralized log-in server, and there is no disclosure or suggestion in Gupta of determining, at a first system that grants session credentials, that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system; retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information corresponding to a possible session credential for a second system that grants session credentials; presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; and determining whether the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system.

Independent claims 9, 10, 11, 12, 17 and 20 include similar limitations, and applicant respectfully submits that those claims are similarly allowable over Gupta.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0184507 to Makower et al.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and applicants have explained above who Gupta does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 5 is therefore allowable over the combination of Gupta and Makower.

Claim 13 states: determining that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by a first system or a second system; sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; and receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential granted by the second system,

the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information.

Applicant submits that the combination of Gupta and Makower does not disclose or suggest determining that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by a first system or a second system; sending, from the first system to the client, a log in page; receiving, at the first system from the client, log in information; sending, from the first system to the second system, the log in information; and receiving, at the first system from the second system, information corresponding to a session credential granted by the second system, the session credential granted by the second system based at least in part on the log in information.

VI. Request for Reconsideration

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



---

Chris L. Holm  
Reg. No.: 39,227

March 30, 2005

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP  
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)